UNITED
NATIONS

S

Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2911
15 March 1990

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND
NINE HUNDRED AND ELEVENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 15 March 1990, at 3.30 p.m.

President:	Mr. AL-ASHTAL	(Democratic Yemen)
Members:	Canada	Mr. FORTIER
	China	Mr. LI Luye
	Colombia	Mr. PEÑALOSA
	Côte d'Ivoire	Mr. ESSY
	Cuba	Mr. MORENO FERNANDEZ
	Ethiopia	Mr. GOSHU
	Finland	Ms. RASI
	France	Mr. BLANC
	Malaysia	Mr. ABU HASSAN
	Romania	Mr. MICU
	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. BELONOGOV
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir Crispin TICKELL
	United States of America	Mr. WATSON
	Zaire	Mr. BAGBENI ADEITO NZENGEYA

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the Security Council.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

90-60329/A 6779V (E)

The meeting was called to order at 4 p.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

THE SITUATION IN THE OCCUPIED ARAB TERRITORIES

LETTER DATED 12 FEBRUARY 1990 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/21139)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): In accordance with the decisions taken at the 2,910th meeting, I invite the representatives of Israel, Jordan and Senegal to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber; I invite the representative of Palestine to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Bein (Israel), Mr. Salah (Jordan) and Mrs. Diallo (Senegal) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber; Mr. Qaddoumi (Palestine) took a place at the Council table.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): The Security Council will now resume its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The first speaker is the representative of Jordan, who wishes to make a statement in his capacity as Chairman of the Group of Arab States for the month of March. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. SALAH (Jordan) (interpretation from Arabic): It is a privilege to address the Council today in my capacity as Chairman of the Group of Arab States for this month.

It gives me great pleasure at the outset to convey to you, Sir, our warmest congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month. We are particularly happy to see you assume the presidency because you represent a brotherly Arab country. My personal acquaintance with you gives me

(Mr. Salah, Jordan)

confidence that your commendable qualities, your efficiency and wisdom will contribute to the success of the Council's work.

I should also like to express to your predecessor, Mr. Ricardo Alarcon de Quesada, our deepest thanks and appreciation for the skill and acumen with which he conducted the Council's work last month.

I also wish to express the thanks of the Arab Group to Their Excellencies the Foreign Minister of Malaysia, Mr. Dato' Abu Hassan Hiji Omar, and the Foreign Minister of Cuba, Mr. Isidoro Malmierca Peoli, for addressing the Security Council on the issue under discussion, which is of concern to all Arab countries.

Once again the Security Council is meeting to consider the situation in the occupied Arab territories, and as usual the reason for this meeting is a serious and negative development in those territories that is detrimental to the interests of its rightful owners and poses a threat to the prospects of peace in the region. The new development that led to the convening of the Council today is the intensified emigration of Jews of the Soviet Union to Israel.

(Mr. Salah, Jordan)

It is expected that by the end of this year there will be around 100,000 new immigrants and that within a few years there will be around 1 million.

The history of Jewish emigration to Palestine is closely linked to the course of the Israeli-Arab conflict, the core of which is the Palestine question. Indeed, this immigration was the reason behind the conflict, and its continuation is a major factor in the persistence of the conflict up to the present day. The relation between Jewish immigration since the 1967 war and the continuation of the Arab-Israeli conflict is of particular concern to us at the present juncture.

We have been warning of the gravity and consequences of this immigration since the Israeli occupation of the Arab territories in 1967. At that time it became obvious that such immigration would have an adverse effect on the human and national rights of the inhabitants of the occupied Arab territories and prospects for peace in the region, since many Jewish immigrants, with the encouragement of the Israeli Government, have settled in the occupied Arab territories after Israel has expropriated parts of those territories and established settlements on them.

The Israeli practices in the occupied Arab territories, particularly in regard to the expropriation of land and the establishment of Jewish settlements on it, are well known to the Security Council. Indeed, these practices are documented in reports by various committees and commissions established by the United Nations to investigate such practices.

I should like to read out two paragraphs from the first report submitted to the Security Council by the three-member Commission established by it under its resolution 446 (1979) to consider the issue of Jewish settlements in the occupied Arab territories, including Jerusalem.

READEX FICHE

(Mr. Salah, Jordan)

Referring to the Israeli policy regarding settlements,

[spoke in English]

"The Commission found evidence that the Israeli Government is engaged in a wilful, systematic and large-scale process of establishing settlements in the occupied territories for which it should bear full responsibility." (S/13450 and Add.1, para. 220)

[continued in Arabic]

With regard to the relation between the establishment of settlements and the displacement of the legitimate inhabitants of the territories, the Commission stated that

[spoke in English]

"a correlation exists between the establishment of Israeli settlements and the displacement of the Arab population." (ibid., para. 221)

[continued in Arabic]

As members are well aware, after studying the reports of the Commission, the Security Council adopted resolution 465 (1980), in which it determined that

"all measures taken by Israel to change the physical character, demographic composition, institutional structure or status of the Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem, or any part thereof, have no legal validity ...". (resolution 465 (1980), para. 5)

The Israeli policies and practices of settling sectors of its population and of the new immigrants in these territories are a grave violation of the Fourth Geneva Convention and a serious obstacle to the establishment of a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

(Mr. Salah, Jordan)

In that resolution the Security Council also called upon the people and Government of Israel to desist henceforth from

"the establishment, construction and planning of settlements in the Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem". (ibid., para. 6)

The Council also called upon

"all States not to provide Israel with any assistance to be used specifically in connection with settlements in the occupied territories". (ibid., para. 7)

A decade has passed and that resolution remains unimplemented. Israel has continued to establish settlements, and certain countries have continued to render assistance to Israel - either materially, thus enabling it to build settlements; or in human terms, enabling Israel to fill these territories with immigrants.

The position of the Israeli Government in regard to its settlement of the occupied Arab territories - or, to put it more accurately, its colonization - needs no comment. It is a position which has been taken by the present Israeli Government as well as its predecessors.

For example, I recall what Golda Meir said in 1973 when she was Prime Minister of Israel:

[spoke in English]

"These outposts and settlements are seeds which will develop in the future, growing in population and becoming more firmly rooted."

[continued in Arabic]

Moshe Dayan said the following in the same year, when he was Minister of Defence:

(Mr. Salah, Jordan)

[spoke in English]

"Israel should stay forever in the West Bank, because this is Judea and Samaria. This is our homeland. We could as well have stayed in America and Russia had we not wanted to come here."

[continued in Arabic]

The recent statements by the Israeli Prime Minister, Yitzhak Shamir, concerning this issue must have drawn the attention of the Security Council. He said, among other things, that these immigrants have the freedom to settle wherever they want; that this large-scale immigration requires the establishment of a Greater Israel; that Israel should persist in controlling the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, in expectation of mass immigration; and that this immigration will make Israel greater, stronger and better. Such statements are extremely serious. They should make the Security Council devote its full and urgent attention to the issue and find an urgent solution to it.

It is not fair to allow Jews from all parts of the world to settle in the occupied Arab territories for no reason other than that they are Jewish, while the Palestinian refugees in the Diaspora are denied their right to return to their land for no reason other than that they are Arabs and Palestinians.

If human rights means giving the Jewish people of the Soviet Union the right to emigrate from their country, human rights certainly do not mean exercising this right at the expense of the Arab Palestinian people.

(Mr. Salah, Jordan)

If there is room within the land on which Israel was established in 1948, it should as a matter of priority be filled by the Palestinian refugees, the owners of those lands who were uprooted from them by force. The right of the Palestinian refugees to return is a human and national inalienable right stressed by the United Nations in various resolutions, particularly General Assembly resolution 194 (III) and Security Council resolution 242 (1967), paragraph 2 (b).

The Israeli policy of settlement in the occupied Arab territories since 1967 has been linked with a policy of systematic deportation and displacement of the rightful inhabitants of those lands. Israel has adopted various forms of repressive and arbitrary practices aimed at making living conditions ever more difficult for the inhabitants of those territories, compelling them to leave their land and resettle elsewhere.

The history of the Israeli occupation of the Arab territories, occupied since 1967, leads us to consider the present intensified and systematic emigration of Jews from the Soviet Union to Israel as a great threat far exceeding previous dangers. The arrival of huge numbers of immigrants to Israel and their settlement in the occupied Arab territories means the continuation of the creeping annexation of those territories and the expulsion of their rightful inhabitants. It also undermines prospects for peace in the region. As a result of that immigration, Israel may sooner or later annex the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, as it did earlier with Arab Jerusalem and the Syrian Arab Golan Heights.

It may also commit the crime of deporting the Palestinian people en masse. That crime is called "transferal" in Israel. Certain Israeli leaders do not hesitate to discuss it as a possible alternative. It should be noted that on 19 June 1988 a referendum was held in Israel concerning the possible mass deportation of the Palestinians. The results of that referendum made it clear that

(Mr. Salah, Jordan)

41 per cent of Israelis supported the idea. In October 1989, according to another referendum, the percentage advocating mass deportation had risen to 52 per cent. This indicates that the circle of support for that immoral idea has widened and that it may in time prove to be a potential solution.

The inalienable national and human rights of the Palestinian people will be the first victims of such a crime. Other victims will be the neighbouring Arab countries, which will be affected by the crime's serious impact. Those countries are still suffering from previous displacements of the Palestinian people, in particular after the wars of 1948 and 1967. The possibility is not a remote one, especially if we take into account the numerous statements made by the leaders of Israel concerning the idea of an alternative homeland. Certainly, Israel's attempt to implement such a plan would lead to a huge explosion in the region on an unprecedented scale.

We welcomed the positive developments in international relations in recent years and were hopeful that the effects of international détente would extend to the Arab-Israeli conflict and help accelerate the process towards a long-overdue political settlement.

However, it seems that the precise opposite has occurred. This dangerous wave of immigration is one of the results of the changes taking place in the Soviet Union in harmony with the improvement in the international atmosphere. The threatening dimensions of this immigration should have been considered before it was allowed to occur, and precautions should thus have been taken to channel it to countries that welcome immigrants and can absorb them - countries in which their presence would entail no danger to human rights, to the national rights of the peoples of those countries, or to peace and security.

(Mr. Salah, Jordan)

The countries that have persistently called for such immigration and exerted pressure to that end should have thrown open their doors to receive the immigrants and to settle them on their own territory. However, those countries did just the opposite: They either set quotas or shut their doors tight in an attempt to force the immigrants to go to Israel, despite the fact that 85 per cent of the Jews leaving the Soviet Union, when given the choice, went to the United States and not to Israel.

What further aggravates the situation is that those immigrants leave their country carrying travel documents and not passports, which means that, even should they want to return to their country, they could not. In such circumstances - in the absence of any other option - the matter becomes a question of evacuation and not emigration. Thus, Israel reaps the harvest of international détente by receiving more immigrants, which strengthens its potential and fuels its war machinery, in the same way that it reaped the harvest of international tension by exploiting the rivalry between the two super-Powers.

Those gains made by Israel in both cases will definitely increase its intransigence and encourage it to persist in its expansionist and aggressive policy in the region. It is a State that has no definitive borders and acknowledges neither being an occupying Power nor the applicability of the fourth Geneva Convention to the territories it occupies. Israel also denies the Palestinian refugees who were expelled from their homes the right to return, and considers the acceptance of the right to return as its own "demographic suicide". That expression was used in a statement made by the present President of Israel, Chaim

(Mr. Salah, Jordan)

Herzog, to the General Assembly during the discussion of the item on Palestine in 1976, when he was a Permanent Representative to the United Nations. He said:

(spoke in English)

"This so-called principle is absolutely unrealistic, as Israel has no intention of committing demographic suicide".

(Mr. Salah, Jordan)

The fact is that the return of the Palestinian refugees to their land would not be demographic suicide for Israel. To the contrary, the immigration of the world's Jews and their settlement in the occupied territories constitute the demographic massacre of the legitimate inhabitants of the territories. In that connection, I would recall what Count Bernadotte, the United Nations Mediator for Palestine, wrote in his 1948 report to the General Assembly on this issue:

(spoke in English)

"It would be an offense against the principles of elemental justice if these innocent victims of the conflict [the Palestinian refugees] were denied the right to return to their homes while Jewish immigrants flow into Palestine".

(continued in Arabic)

This new flow of Jewish immigration to Israel increases our fears and concerns more than ever for several reasons: First, this immigration is at the expense of the inalienable national and human rights of the Arab Palestinian people and the Syrian citizens of the Syrian Arab Golan.

Secondly, Israel will use the immigration as an excuse to continue its occupation of the Arab territories, claiming it needs them to absorb the new immigrants. It will use the immigrants to fuel its war machine and to encourage Israel to persist in its expansionist, aggressive policies against Arab countries.

Thirdly, a peaceful settlement has not yet been achieved, and the immigration and the resulting settlements in the occupied Arab territories undermine the "land for peace" formula, which is viewed unanimously as a basis for the establishment of peace in the region. They thus impede peace efforts and make the establishment of peace impossible.

(Mr. Salah, Jordan)

Fourthly, Israel still refuses to see itself as an occupying Power and rejects the applicability to the occupied Arab territories of the fourth Geneva Convention. It also rejects the relevant United Nations resolutions, in particular those declaring its practices in the occupied Arab territories illegal and calling on it to halt them.

For those reasons, and against the background of the sacred Palestinian intifadah - which highlights the Palestinian people's categorical rejection of Israeli occupation and its determination to gain its inalienable national rights - and the peaceful Palestinian position as expressed by the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), as we all know the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, it is clear that this new wave of immigration has serious repercussions that deserve urgent attention and decisive measures by the Security Council.

Today the Security Council must be more effective than ever. Effectiveness lies not in the adoption of resolutions, but in their implementation. The Council has already adopted many resolutions on the occupied Arab territories; these remain dead letters owing to their rejection by Israel and the Council's failure to use its powers against that rejection.

The question of immigration, on which the Council is meeting today, is important, but it is only one aspect of a complex problem: the Arab-Israeli conflict, the core of which is the Palestinian question. So long as that question remains without a total solution, the various problems stemming from it will also remain without a total solution.

With respect to the problem of Jewish immigration now under discussion, we expect the following from the Security Council: the suspension of that immigration to Israel or its redirection to other countries until a peaceful settlement is achieved; reaffirmation of past Security Council resolutions on this subject,

(Mr. Salah, Jordan)

particularly resolution 465 (1980); reaffirmation of the applicability of the fourth Geneva Convention to the occupied Arab territories; reaffirmation of the illegality of the settlements in the occupied Arab territories and of the need to make Israel desist from establishing them and remove those already in place; assurance that all countries will stop providing any assistance to Israel that could be used specifically in connection with the settlements in the occupied Arab territories; and a request to the Secretary-General to monitor the implementation of the resolution to be adopted by the Security Council in this matter and to submit a report to the Council within a reasonable period of time.

It would be appropriate to stress once more the need for intensified efforts to achieve a just, lasting and comprehensive settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict through an international conference, and on the basis of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) and the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian people. Such a settlement would once and for all solve all the problems stemming from that conflict, including the problem of immigration now under discussion.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I thank the representative of Jordan for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Senegal. I invite her to take a place at the Council table and to make her statement.

Mrs. DIALLO (Senegal) (interpretation from French): I should like to thank you, Mr. President, and the other members of the Security Council for granting me this opportunity to participate in the discussion on a subject of particular concern to Senegal and to the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, over which I have the honour to preside on behalf of my country.

(Mrs. Diallo, Senegal)

I should like at the outset to say how pleased our delegation is to see you, Sir, presiding over the Security Council during March. We wish to congratulate you warmly, and we are sure that you will continue to guide the work of the Council with your usual dynamism and competence. I cannot fail to pay a well-deserved tribute to your predecessor, Ambassador Ricardo Alarcon de Quesada of Cuba, for the way in which he discharged his duties during February.

In my dual capacity as representative of Senegal and Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, I have asked to be allowed to take part in the Council's debate because we are deeply concerned at recent developments in Israel's settlements policy in the occupied Palestinian territory.

I am pleased to note and hail the presence here and the distinguished participation this morning of Their Excellencies the Foreign Ministers of Palestine, Malaysia and Cuba, which demonstrate the significance and acuteness of this issue that is of concern to the whole international community.

Recent statements by certain Israeli leaders show once again Israel's obstinacy in denying the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian people and refusing to admit that the Fourth Geneva Convention is applicable to the Palestinian territory occupied since 1967, despite the relevant Security Council and General Assembly resolutions.

The settlements policy in the occupied territory carried out by Israel since 1967 has been unanimously rejected and condemned by the international community. It led the Security Council, in resolution 446 (1979), to establish a Commission consisting of three of its members to examine the situation relating to settlements in the occupied territories. When this Commission submitted its second report, the Security Council, on 1 March 1980, adopted resolution 465 (1980), in which it accepted the conclusions and recommendations contained therein.

(Mrs. Diallo, Senegal)

The Council determined that all measures taken by Israel to change the physical character, demographic composition, institutional structure or status of the Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem, or any part thereof have no legal validity. In the Council's view, Israel's policy and practices of settling parts of its population and new immigrants in those territories constituted a flagrant violation of the Fourth Geneva Convention and also constituted a serious obstruction to achieving a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East. The Council also called upon all States not to provide Israel with any assistance to be used specifically in connexion with settlements in the occupied Territories.

In its third report the Commission noted a continuing deterioration in the situation in the occupied Palestinian territories and reaffirmed that the Israeli settlements policy was still being actively, deliberately and systematically pursued, using methods that were often coercive, in total disregard of fundamental human rights. This policy had led to radical and adverse changes in the economic and social structures of the daily life of the Arab population that had remained in the occupied territories and, in addition, to profound geographic and demographic changes in them, including Jerusalem, in violation of the Fourth Geneva Convention and Security Council resolutions In view of the growing deterioration in the situation, the Commmission believed that Israel's settlements policy and the unjustified suffering being imposed on a defenceless population could lead to further disorder and acts of violence, and recommended that appropriate means be found, under the auspices of the United Nations, to put an end to the situation. Unfortunately, as members know, the Security Council was not able to take up the Commission's third report, and hence its recommendations could not be implemented.

Thus, despite the urgent appeals of the international community, Israel has pursued and accelerated its settlements policy. According to recent information,

(Mrs. Diallo, Senegal)

the area of the lands confiscated by Israel since 1967 had, in 1989, reached approximately 55 per cent of the total area of the occupied territories. There are 185 settlements on the West Bank and 22 in the Gaza Strip, while the number of settlers is estimated at 70,000. Moreover, about 120,000 Israelis are said to have settled in new neighbourhoods in East Jerusalem built up since the beginning of the occupation in 1967.

This policy of creeping annexation of the occupied territory can only be part of a plan carefully prepared and implemented in accordance with very precise objectives and time tables.

Was it not the former Israeli Defence Minister who in October 1982 declared:

"Massive settlement throughout the West Bank is the best response to the various plans people from abroad would impose on Israel?"

Naturally, to reach this objective, Israel has taken a host of measures so as to stifle any kind of political, cultural, social and economic expression on the part of the Palestinian people. These measures have been accompanied by acts of violence, intimidation and provocation committed against Palestinians by armed Israeli settlers, not to mention expulsions and other forms of banishment.

This situation has only grown worse since the beginning of the intifadah. In its report to the forty-third session of the General Assembly in 1988 the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People expressed its profound concern over the growing participation of armed Israeli settlers in attacks against the Palestinian population. In its report to the forty-fourth session of the Assembly the Committee expressed its grave concern of Israel's increase resort to armed force in an attempt to snuff out the intifadah. In November 1989 it was reported that a reserve company of the Israeli armed forces made up of settlers had been sent to the West Bank. In my letters addressed to the

(Mrs. Diallo, Senegal)

Secretary-General and to the President of the Security Council on behalf of the Committee, on many occasions I reported serious incidents arising out of acts of violence by groups of settlers that had caused many casualties among Palestinians.

(Mrs. Diallo, Senegal)

According to figures that recently appeared in the American press, the number of immigrants will rise from 50,000 in 1990 to 750,000 in the course of this decade. As a result of the new immigration the Jewish population settled in East Jerusalem since 1967 could grow by 60 per cent, and the population of the Jewish colonies in the West Bank could grow by 10 per cent in the near future. More than 2,000 Israeli families are said to have been settled in the occupied territory in 1989. It has been reported that the settlers already living there are actively encouraging new immigrants to come to the occupied territory and that the Israeli Government is co-operating in that effort by offering large cash bonuses, low-interest mortages and practically free land.

New immigrants are immediately settled in the West Bank, while Israeli soldiers, implementing the extremely strict residence laws, are deporting Palestinians whose families have lived there for generations. Reliable sources note the existence in the West Bank of a growing campaign to break up families, and, as a result of Israeli-imposed restrictions, tens of thousands of Palestinians who returned to the occupied territory after the 1967 war with limited-residence permits and who remained in the territory are regarded as foreigners by the occupation authorities, who expelled several hundred Palestinians in 1989, for the most part women and children, and who have deported around 50 for political reasons since the outbreak of the Intifada.

The former mayor of Hebron, Mr. Mustafa el-Natsheh, was expressing Palestinian fears when he stated:

> "the Israelis refuse to grant the Palestinians the right to return to the region, but at the same time they are also bringing in Jewish immigrants. We want to have our Palestinian State alongside Israel and to settle Palestinian refugees in it, but the immigration of Jews from abroad will alter the demography, the aspect of the occupied regions."

(Mrs. Diallo, Senegal)

The Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People has noted the statements made by the Governments of the Soviet Union and the United States of America condemning Israel's present policy with regard to the settlement of the occupied territory. The Committee fully supports those statements and the statements of other Governments and of intergovernmental and non-govermental organizations on that subject, and it shares their concerns. The Committee wishes to join in the appeals that have been made to the Government of Israel to implement the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949 and the relevant resolutions of the Security Council and to refrain from actions likely to alter the demographic composition of the occupied Palestinian territory. We urge all the parties concerned to ensure that the members of the Jewish community immigrating to Israel are not used to perpetuate the occupation of Palestinian territory, to hinder the peace process and to deny the Palestine people the exercise of their inalienable national rights.

In that connection I am happy to be able to stress there that Senegal, faithful to its convictions and constant in its commitment to justice, supports the right of each individual freely to emigrate to the country of his choice, but that it cannot agree that the exercise of that right can be imposed by a third Power to the detriment of the host populations - in this case to the detriment of the Palestinian populations.

Now that throughout the world dialogue and negotiations are the chosen means for finding solutions to outstanding problems, now that welcome initiatives are being taken by many Governments, demonstrating promising political courage, now that even the supporters of apartheid seem to realize the aberrance of that policy based on violence, persecution, racial discrimination and the denial of rights and freedoms, new risks are seriously threatening international peace, security and

(Mrs. Diallo, Senegal)

stability owing to the obstinacy of the Israeli Government in swimming against the current of history.

We, and the Security Council, must resolutely oppose the policies and practices of Israel and its defiant and provocative stand in order that the injustice from which the Palestinians, continue to suffer in their occupied homeland not be transformed into an even more fearful tragedy.

It is up to us to support the initiatives now being taken to bring all the parties concerned to enter into constructive negotiations and to ensure the convening of the international conference on the Middle East with a view to a peaceful, comprehensive, just and lasting settlement.

In order to achieve that pressing objective we must rise above our habitual differences.

Soon, amidst general rejoicing, an independent Namibia will take the place it has won, through bitter struggle, in the concert of free nations. That glorious illustration of the victory of right over violence, of freedom over injustice, should be an inspiration to those who are trying to disregard the inalienable rights of peoples fighting for the triumph of their legitimate aspirations.

I hope that the Security Council's work will enable us to go forward on a course that will also enable the courageous Palestinians, too, to regain all their inalienable national rights and to make their contribution to the international community in building a world of peace, justice and prosperity.

Senegal, which has constantly and devotedly pursued this course, will continue to work to that end.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I thank the representative of Senegal for the kind words she addressed to me.

(The President)

The next speaker is the representative of Israel. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. BEIN (Israel): The issues raised in the debate today are but one aspect in the multifaceted Arab-Israeli conflict. Such an intricate and complex conflict can be addressed constructively only in the context of comprehensive negotiations between the parties directly involved. Had this road been followed from the start, the enmity and tensions could have been defused long ago. Had direct negotiations been commenced, many of the contentious issues, some of which are being manipulated and blown up out of all proportion, would not have arisen in the first place.

Since last May all diplomatic activity aimed at initiation of dialogue has been based on Israel's peace initiative of 14 May 1989.

(Mr. Bein, Israel)

At present a domestic political crisis is brewing in Israel. Yet Israel, to my knowledge, is the only State in which internal political crises, the rise and fall of Governments, are determined not by social, economic or environmental issues, but by the agonizing problem of how to pursue peace, how to follow the most effective path and utilize the best means in order to expedite the process leading to peace.

This is neither the time nor the place to focus on the contentious issues and mutual grievances that lie at the heart of the Arab-Israeli conflict. Disagreements must and will be addressed when negotiations commence. The positions of the parties are well known; their endless repetition here only adds fuel to the fire.

At this critical juncture advancing the peace process should be the highest priority of all the parties concerned. Exercising discretion would contribute to avoiding the pitfalls that lie ahead.

I should have preferred to end my statement on this note, say "Thank you, Mr. President", and return to my seat. Unfortunately, we have been made to sit through another round of accusations levelled against Israel which cannot remain unanswered.

We are witnessing historic transformations taking place around the world. Walls are crumbling, and the message of democracy and freedom is resurging. Borders are open and freedom of movement is benefiting people of all nationalities. Among them are Jews who seek a safe haven and wish to live in freedom and dignity in their national homeland in Israel.

Following millenia of repression, persecution, blood-libels and pogroms, culminating in the industrialized slaughter of 6 million Jews in the Nazi Holocaust, the State of Israel was reborn. This was the realization of an age-old

(Mr. Bein, Israel)

dream, echoed in the words of the prophet Isaiah, who proclaimed that the Lord

"shall assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth". (The Holy Bible, Isaiah 11:12)

The Jewish people would henceforth be guaranteed a permanent safe haven, a shelter to which they could immigrate. Never again would the Jewish people find themselves helpless in the face of imminent mortal danger. Never again would they find the gates of freedom closed before them. The gates of Israel would for ever be open. Such is the guarantee to Jews the world over by the Law of Return, the Basic Law of Israel:

"every Jew has the right to immigrate to the country."

This is the very essence, the raison d'être, of Israel.

Indeed, Israel has absorbed its people: wave after wave of destitute refugees; people who fled for their lives, having nowhere else to turn; the wretched survivors of the concentration and death camps in Europe; the 800,000 refugees from Arab countries, many of whom escaped with their lives, leaving everything behind; the refugees and immigrants from black Africa, Asia and the Americas.

In fact, the members of our delegation present in this Chamber represent a microcosm of modern Israel. We are all first- or second-generation refugees or immigrants from four continents.

The mass immigration of Jews from the Soviet Union is the culmination of a long, difficult and strenuous international struggle, in which the free world as a whole - Governments, parliaments, statesmen and communities - have played a leading role. We deeply appreciate these efforts, and we commend the determination of the Soviet Union to conform with international practice and grant freedom of movement to its citizens. This momentous development is particularly critical today, when

(Mr. Bein, Israel)

the darker side of democratization is generating a resurgence of virulent anti-semitism.

At the very same time an ugly campaign is being waged by Arab States, a campaign of a scope and proportion unprecedented in recent years, with the aim of halting the immigration of Jews to Israel altogether. While various pretexts are put forth, the attacks are being directed against the immigration itself - and we have heard it here. Jewish immigration, however, lies at the foundation of the existence of the State of Israel. Hence, those who oppose Jewish immigration to the Jewish State are expressing their opposition to our very existence.

The accusations levelled against Israel in this debate, implying that Israel intends to displace Palestinians by the massive settlement of Jewish immigrants in their place, are preposterous. They have no basis whatsoever. Rather, these contentions are the latest manifestation of the longstanding campaign against the Jewish State, a campaign which is often veiled by sundry euphemistic slogans, such as "armed struggle", "racial discrimination", "settlement", "anti-Zionism", "the liberation of Palestine", or the campaign to halt Jewish immigration.

For over 40 years Arab States and their various proxies and organizations have done their utmost to delegitimize the only Jewish State, to crush it physically and to undermine it politically, diplomatically and economically. Indeed, their concerted efforts to halt Jewish immigration began long before Israel controlled Judea, Samaria and the Gaza district. What we are witnessing today is the culmination of a systematic Arab campaign, dating back to the beginning of the Arab-Israeli conflict, directed against the very essence of Israel as the home for the Jewish people, against the right of Jews to a State of their own, and against peace and accommodation with the reality of Israel.

We remember how in the early part of this century Jewish refugees fled

(Mr. Bein, Israel)

anti-semitic persecution in Europe, only to be met by belligerent Arab opposition. We remember that the Arab leaders of the 1930s and 1940s were swayed by the Mufti of Jerusalem, Haj Amin al-Husseini, who, from his base in Nazi Germany, conspired not only to halt all Jewish immigration, but physically to annihilate the Jewish communities in Europe and Palestine. Complementing his efforts before, during and after the Second World War, the Arab leadership maintained unceasing pressure on the British authorities of Mandated Palestine to bar all Jewish immigration.

We cannot forget that that Arab pressure culminated in the dispatch of a Royal Commission to "investigate the situation" in Palestine and in the notorious White Paper issued by the British Mandatory authorities on 17 May 1939, which imposed harsh restrictions on Jewish immigration, to be followed by a total ban. That date, 17 May 1939, was six years after the rise of Nazi Germany, a time when the mortal danger facing the Jewish refugees from Europe was already public knowledge, one year following the Nazi anschluss of Austria, on the heels of the Nazi conquest of Czechoslovakia, and two months prior to the assault on Poland. The moral implications were disregarded then, as they are disregarded today.

As Arab leaders then were fervent in their attempts to deny access to the only sanctuary available to the Jews, so did they reject any accommodation with a Jewish State in their midst. The 1947 United Nations partition resolution was thus rejected out of hand. So was recognition of Israel's right to exist, even before the Six-Day War. As they rejected resolution 242 (1967) and the Camp David Accords, so many of them now reject Israel's peace initiative of May 1989.

(Mr. Bein, Israel)

This ongoing belligerency has not ceased. Today, 42 years after its rebirth, Israel still faces Arab rejection of its very existence. Mr. Qadhaffi of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya calls for all-out war on Israel with bloodcurdling imagery:

"The liberation of Palestine ... is only a matter of time. ... Palestine is a grave for the Jews ... a collective oven for all the Jews. Therefore I advise the Jews to leave the oven before it ... starts boiling, and return to their countries ... Alaska is a very appropriate place to set up a Jewish State ... I warn them, get out of the tomb before you get buried."

That is from the JANA News Agency, Tripoli, Libya, 6 January 1990.

Such unabashed threats: should they be ignored? Dare we disregard such swaggering by Libya, that hostile nation that produced and amassed stockpiles of chemical weapons - poison gas - in Rabta?

Arafat can only concur:

"the Jews in occupied Palestine should return to their countries of origin ... the popular revolution will continue until all Palestinian soil is liberated".

That is from JANA, dated 8 January 1990.

On 8 March 1990 President Assad of Syria called for an eternal jihad, a holy war against Israel "until the end of time".

Preparations are currently under way for the establishment of what is called an eastern front of confrontation against Israel - a military alliance joining the forces of Syria, Jordan, Iraq and the PLO able to mobilize close to 3 million men under arms.

And as if all this is not enough, an old pernicious argument has resurfaced lately, a return to the infamous line of the late Saudi Ambassador Baroodi, who used to state in the Security Council that not only do the Jews have no right to a sovereign State in Israel but they are not even Jews: all the more reason to deny

(Mr. Bein, Israel)

them a homeland. They are, he argued, the descendants of the Khazars, a tribe converted to Judaism in the 8th century.

This nonsense has made a remarkable comeback lately.

In his 8 March speech, President Assad declared, "The Soviet Jews are Khazars. They are neither the descendants of Issac and Shem, nor even of Noah". In an interview on French television, Arafat tells us that the Soviet Jews are not really Jews: "They do not belong to the 12 tribes of Israel," says Arafat. "They are being kidnapped en masse by Israel." That was said in an interview, Arret Sur Image, on 26 February 1990.

Qadhaffi goes even further: he calls for the deportation of Israel's Jews to Estonia and Lithuania - the lands of the Khazars. That, claims Qadhaffi, is the way to achieve what he calls a just peace - JANA News Agency, Tripoli, Libya, 6 January.

In the Middle East, where verbal incitement often leads to bloodshed, such statements must not be ignored. Only six weeks ago nine Israeli tourists were killed and 17 were injured when their sightseeing bus was attacked on the road to Ismailia. Numerous organizations competed to take credit for that massacre. One of them was the notorious Islamic Jihad, which has close operational links with Arafat's Fatah group. The motive, according to the Islamic Jihad, was to remind Soviet Jews that Israel is not the land of milk and honey but the land of death. I quote:

> "Here we witness the tens of thousands of Soviet Jews descending upon our Holy Land, dressed in military uniform, in order to oppress our Arab people. ... The Islamic Jihad is laying in wait for you ... We tell the Zionists in Palestine and everywhere else: we will fight you, women, children and the elderly ... the armed struggle is our road to Palestine."

That is quoted from Radio al-Quds, Damascus, 5 February.

(Mr. Bein, Israel)

This is the essence of the so-called armed struggle, a euphemism for the indiscriminate murder of Jewish civilians, the battle cry of those intent onfoiling any move towards a peaceful resolution of the conflict. The intense political pressure aimed at halting Jewish immigration to Israel should be understood in this context. This is clearly evident in the plethora of press articles appearing in almost every Arab newspaper these days. The Kuwaiti newspaper Al-Qabas had this to say on 22 February:

> "The just solution is for Palestine to be returned to what it was prior to Jewish immigration ... The existence of Israel is unlawful, and the just solution, therefore, is that Israel cease to exist. ... Those Jews who came from here, there or anywhere must return to their own lands. This is true justice ... that which was taken by force will be returned only with force, through the Islamic Jihad."

So says Al-Qabas of Kuwait.

On 15 February 1990 United National Leadership - PLO published its latest directive, which stated, inter alia:

> "The leadership demands that the Soviet authorities stop the direct emigration from the Soviet Union to Israel and calls on the PLO and all Arab States and the Arab masses ... to act resolutely in order to halt the flow of Jewish emigrants to Israel".

That was published in leaflet No. 52, of 15 February.

All this is predicated on the resolutions passed on 8 August 1989 at the fifth general congress of the PLO Fatah faction, which proclaimed that "The crime was consummated by the partition of Palestine and the establishment of the Zionist entity in 1948" and that

> "Fatah has appointed a special committee whose role it is to deter new Jewish immigrants from coming to Israel."

(Mr. Bein, Israel)

That is quoted from AFP, 8 August.

Arab States have conjured up a major diplomatic storm in a world-wide effort to block the flow of Jewish immigrants. The real objective behind this campaign is to halt all Jewish immigration to Israel, period. It is the potential strengthening of Israel by immigration that arouses their vehement opposition, since they have always desired to limit Israel's population and thereby the strength, Jewish character and permanence of our country. More accurately, the underlying impetus for this activity is the shattered illusion that, given the passage of time, Israel inevitably will wither away from the map of the Middle East.

As the Saudi newspaper Al-Riad puts it,

"If Palestine is not turned into an inferno by escalation of the military struggle in order to deter the Russian immigrants, then the Jews in Palestine will number over 8 million by the beginning of the 21st century."

That is quoted from Al-Riad, Saudi Arabia, 27 January.

Likewise, the fundamentalist Hamas movement, in its 52nd leaflet, dated 15 February, stated:

"This is the most mortal danger the Palestinian problem has ever had to face, regardless of whether the Soviet immigrants settle in the West Bank and Gaza or in the occupied Palestine of 1948."

I emphasize that: "the occupied Palestine of 1948".

(Mr. Bein, Israel)

President Sadam Hussein of Iraq, addressing the Arab Co-operation Council meeting in Amman, had this to say:

"The argument that they should be prohibited from living in the Arab territories occupied after 1967 is not sufficient, since the immigrants, in any place in which they are present, strengthen Israeli society".

That is quoted from the Arab Press Service, 19 February 1990.

This, then, is the true nature of the so-called problem: Israel is committing a colossal sin by refusing to simply wither away. Arab States were aware, however, that open opposition to the universal right of immigration would be unpopular. It also did not escape their attention that a professed willingness to live in peace with Israel flies in the face of opposition to Jewish immigration to the Jewish State. An acceptable pretext had to be found: hence the trumped-up and preposterous charge that Israel intends to displace the Palestinians by settling Jewish immigrants in their place.

The inverse is true. Far from displacing Palestinians, Israel has been the only party actively engaged in rehabilitating them. Since 1967 Israel has enabled tens of thousands of Palestinians to return to Judea, Samaria and Gaza under the family reunification plan. Moreover, since 1971, Israel has rehabilitated over 150,000 Palestinian refugees in Gaza in the face of strong opposition by the Arab States. One hundred fifty thousand Palestinian refugees have left the refugee camps of their own volition and reside today in permanent housing in modern neighbourhoods in the Gaza district.

It has been claimed, in this context, that Israel as a matter of policy is directing Jewish immigrants to the territories. There are no grounds for this allegation. The facts speak for themselves. Over 99 per cent of the immigrants have settled in Israel's main urban centres. The Minister of Absorption reiterated

(Mr. Bein, Israel)

Israel's unequivocal policy on this matter on 28 February:

"I wish to deliver a strong and decisive message. Immigrants will not be diverted to settlement in the territories."

Those advancing the allegation that a danger is being posed to the demographic composition of the territories know that there are no grounds on which to support it. Their only recourse is, therefore, to cling to words attributed to Israel's Prime Minister, who supposedly stated that more territory is needed for the immigrants. In order to set the record straight, Prime Minister Shamir made the following statement in the Knesset, Israel's Parliament, on 13 February:

"The permanent status of Judea, Samaria and Gaza will be discussed in negotiations which will be conducted according to the guidelines and circumstances detailed in decisions of successive Governments of Israel and in keeping with the international accords to which Israel is a party. And we are mindful of this. ... The Government has no policy that directs immigrants to the areas of Judea, Samaria and Gaza."

Two days later Prime Minister Shamir stated in a public address:

"The attempt to hang this Arab campaign on a statement attributed to me concerning a great land of Israel pales and fades into insignificance given the dimensions and extremism of the attacks against us. My remarks about the need for a strong and secure country to absorb the waves of immigration, which have been distorted and exploited for the campaign against us, contained nothing that could be interpreted as a desire to direct the new immigrants specifically to Judea-Samaria and the Gaza District. Nor is this the policy of the Government of Israel."

(Mr. Bein, Israel)

There are many regions in Israel, such as the Galilee in the north or the Negev in the south, which are underpopulated and await reclamation and development. Immigration coupled with peaceful coexistence will spur on this process.

Those who refuse to accept the reality of a secure and developing sovereign Jewish State, and persist in pursuing the dream of overrunning it, continue to oppose Jewish immigration to Israel. Yet the time has come for them to realize that in this era of openness and democratization the massive return of Jews to their historic homeland is further confirmation that the anachronistic dream of doing away with Israel is becoming increasingly unpalatable and self-defeating.

There are obviously fundamental differences in the basic positions of the parties to the Arab-Israeli conflict. These cannot be resolved by yet another round of highly contentious debates. Differences can be bridged only by means of dialogue and negotiation. Let us not allow this debate to be diverted by forces that work against this very process. Israel, for its part, will continue its genuine and ongoing efforts to encourage and further the process which, hopefully, will lead to a negotiated resolution of the Arab-Israeli conflict and true peace in our troubled area.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): Mr. Clovis Maksoud, Permanent Observer of the League of Arab States to the United Nations, to whom the Council, at the 2910th meeting, extended an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure wishes to make a statement.

I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make that statement.

Mr. MAKSOUD: On behalf of the League of Arab States, I should like to tell you, Sir, how proud we are at seeing you presiding over the Security Council today. Your presidency is the crowning point of your commitment to the broad Arab causes, and specifically to the cause of human liberation. Your country has

(Mr. Maksoud)

greatly contributed in this Organization to the cause of peace. Your diplomatic talents and your intellectual coherence and integrity have been major assets for the Arab Group and the League of Arab States.

A great deal has been said today about the purposes of the deliberations by the Security Council. These deliberations are being held at a very crucial time in the evolution of the peace process.

(Mr. Maksoud)

The issue as it arises during the present crisis amidst the authorities governing Israel - a crisis which has led today to the vote of no confidence in the Shamir Government - carries with it the seeds of continued procrastination and paralysis, and thus an attempt to disguise what is taking place in Israel in terms of delay and prevarication under the pretense of forming a new Government.

In a way, Israel seeks to hold its violations of the human and national rights of the Palestinians, of the Geneva Convention, of international law, hostage to its new internecine political situation. Therefore, while the debate in the Council is taking place, we are at the same time in a situation which some might think is promising because of the so-called flexibility in style that might emerge as a result of the removal of Mr. Shamir. Yet, what is essential is the constants and not the surface variables of the political conditions in the Israeli political equation.

Hence, it is important not to be derailed or diverted from the substantive focus of the issues involved, not only as a consequence of the massive Soviet Jewish immigration, but also of the whole problematic that Israel's continued intransigence and procrastination have introduced.

Let me refer to the Israeli statements and contrived paranoia, either about the Soviet Union or about Arab and Palestinian objectives in Palestine. That contrived paranoia is predicated on the basic philosophic constants of the whole Zionist programme. That was demonstrated today in this debate by the insistence that the whole raison d'être of the Israeli State is that it is a haven for all the Jews, as prescribed in the so-called Law of Return. We in the Arab States have decided not to try to visit history but to try to spell out the future. But if history is to be briefly visited, then let us examine this Israeli insistence on the massive Soviet-Jewish immigration and let us correct the deliberate distortions of our Palestinian and Arab resistance to that immigration.

(Mr. Maksoud)

The Law of Return which, according to the Israeli representatives, is the raison d'être of the State of Israel, is a law of return that excludes the right of return of Palestinian refugees to their homes inside Israel. In the same way, it denies the right of the Palestinian people in the occupied Palestinian territory to self-determination and the independence of its State. That Law of Return is exclusive, and it is exclusive because it spells out in no uncertain terms that the land of Palestine is the anchor of the ultimate Jewish destiny.

What did we say? What did the Arab League Summit resolution state? What did the Palestine National Council state in 1988 when it declared the independent State of Palestine? They have acquiesced to the partition. They have recognized the two-State system in historic Palestine. They have recognized the legality of the international consensus as it was spelled out in Security Council resolution 242 (1967), whereby the occupied territories of Palestine are the parameters of the national patrimony of the Palestinian State.

All this is swept away by invoking distorted translations of editorials and individual writers. All this, as a manifestation of the constant commitments of the Arab States, the Arab League and the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), is not taken seriously because Israel wants to ascertain its constants, whether it is a Likud or a Labour Government.

What are those constants? First, that the "land for peace" formula is to remain in limbo. On the one hand, the Likud Party states that Eretz Israel is the land of Israel - namely, the West Bank, the Gaza Strip, the Golan Heights, and now southern Lebanon - but that their annexation is to be done gradually, unannounced, surreptitiously - creeping annexation. Others are saying that "land for peace" is an acceptable formula. But they do not specify what land. They do not acknowledge that they are in the occupied territories as an occupying Power. They do not admit that the settlements are illegal. As a matter of fact, we must not forget that in

(Mr. Maksoud)

the constants of Israeli policies, those settlements were established by the Labour Government and proliferated in the Likud Government afterwards.

Therefore, the Law of Return is part of the plan of an Israel which is still indeterminable today, because, as we all know, Israel is the only State that has no announced borders or frontiers. Therefore, through the Law of Return and the encouragement of massive Soviet-Jewish immigration, Israel is saying that it has to be recognized not as a State but as a "State in the making". Where does that process take place? That cannot be announced or declared, for fear that those who support Israel might withold their support, because, if you do not negotiate on the basis of borders, then what are you negotiating?

(Mr. Maksoud)

That is the root of the virulent Israeli objections and opposition to the PLO as the negotiators on behalf of the Palestinian people.

It is in that context that we must rediscover what the constants really are. They are that East Jerusalem is occupied territory; that Jerusalem is the capital of the Paletinian State; that Jerusalem is part of the Arab patrimony; that Jerusalem is as sacred to the Muslim and the Christian as it is to the Jew. It is therefore inconceivable, so long as Jerusalem is defined as including more than 30 per cent of the West Bank, to say that it constitutes the so-called eternal capital of Israel.

When the President of the United States states the East Jerusalem is occupied territory, all hell breaks loose because he has touched a raw nerve in the basic thrust of Zionist ideology. When President Bush states that there should be no new settlements in East Jerusalem, Israelis respond, with totally self-righteous arrogance, that there is no such thing as settlements in East Jerusalem: the expanded areas of East Jerusalem are new "neighbourhoods". That is semantic acrobatics at its best.

In truth we are facing not only a diplomatic and political problem; we are facing a conceptual and philosophical challenge. Israeli delegations repeat that Israel is the haven for the Jews and project the notion that anti-Semitism is inherent in human nature, that anti-Semitism is inevitable, and that therefore an expanding Israel is inevitable. Otherwise how can we explain that massive Jewish immigration to Israel is such a cardinal point? Today it is the Soviet Jews; tomorrow it might be other Jews; earlier it was Ethiopian Jews. In the Soviet Union, before the current process of democratization, we had the "refuseniks"; the United States exercised its influence to secure the right of emigration for Soviet Jews. Now that democratization has taken place, Soviet Jews remain potential

(Mr. Maksoud)

targets of persecution and discrimination. In both cases, Israel is seeking to project the notion that in every system, whether suppressive or democratic, Jews are targeted for inevitable persecution and discrimination. What the Israelis are trying to do through this contrived paranoia is establish the precedent that Israel is the ultimate locus for the entire Jewish diaspora.

Then they proclaim that the Palestinians and the Arab States are addicted to paranoia. Where is this mass of Soviet Jews going to settle? That brings us to the new "aspirin". The aspirin is that Soviet Jewish immigrants prefer the cities and do not want to go into settlements. They keep repeating ad infinitum that 1 per cent of Soviet Jews have settled in the occupied territories. It is 1 per cent now, 2 per cent tomorrow, 5 per cent later on: so long as the settlements are treated as focal points for territorial annexation, how can we expect the Israeli Government to say that Soviet Jews are not going to be encouraged to go there, but that other Jews can go? As a matter of fact, American Jews constitute 60 per cent of the settlers in the occupied territories today - and those American Jews were not the object either of discrimination or of persecution.

Therefore the floodgates have the potential to open, especially when Israel, as indicated in its response to the Baker plan, wants deliberately to exclude the option of self-determination for the Palestinian people by declaring that anybody with direct or indirect connections with the PLO cannot be entrusted with negotiated so-called municipal rights in the West Bank and Gaza.

It is the assumption that anti-Semitism is inevitable - maybe not in one stage, but in phases - that has been a basic challenge for the Palestinian people, for the Arabs and for the international community; it has also constituted a fundamental challenge to the Jewish population wherever it might be. If there is any attempt at discrimination against Jews anywhere, what should be advocated is

(Mr. Maksoud)

confronting the discriminators, not running away; not coexisting with the discriminator, but facing him, fighting him, confronting him. In the United States, in Britain, in our countries we have experienced all forms of discrimination. But to the Americans, to the Soviets, to the Arabs, discrimination is a problem. To Israel, as to apartheid South Africa, it is a policy. The contrived paranoia that they are inevitably going to be persecuted is thus an attempt to justify and prescribe future expansion in the next historical phase of the Zionist plan.

This is spiritual violence conducted philosophically not only against us, but against the sense of belonging and integration that Jews all over feel: the feeling that they are part of the countries and societies to which they belong. It is accepted that there might be individual Soviet Jews, or individual Jews anywhere, who are discriminated against and persecuted, and that their right of emigration should be guaranteed. The right of emigration anywhere should be acceptable: it is a part of human rights that must be exercised in total freedom. But massive immigration because of a particular religious or ethnic background is a form of racism in reverse. And as the Chairman of the Arab Group, the representative of Jordan, said today, to discriminate against the right of the Palestinian refugees in Lebanon, in Syria and in Jordan to have access to their homes because they are not of the Jewish persuasion is institutional discrimination.

(Mr. Maksoud)

So the problem we face today is not a question of immigration under the rubric of human rights. It is the attempt to build a new empire in a State that is borderless, that ex cathedra has annexed the Golan Heights and East Jerusalem in violation of all United Nations resolutions, and expanded through creeping annexation in the West Bank, that lays claim to the West Bank and Gaza under the pretext of "Judea and Samaria". All that causes us much profound anxiety with regard to our national security.

This is not paranoia. We have had a pattern in which we have seen in the first wave of immigration in the aftermath of the partition of Palestine that the Palestinians were made the targets and the victims of the consequences of the crisis of conscience of Western civilization as a result of the tragedy that had befallen many Jews, many Russians and many others throughout the world. At that time Israel came to the West and said: "We will not ask you any more questions about what you have done to Jews in the past, provided that you in the West do not ask Israel what it is doing to the Palestinians in the present."

This mutual absolution of each other's guilt was at the expense of the Palestinians. The Palestinian people have become reconciled to this reality, despite the fact that their collective memory will not forget their sense of belonging. But they have become reconciled. However, there is now the new Soviet Jewish immigration as a new massive wave of immigration. The global historical changes taking place in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union and the rapprochement between the two super-Powers are welcome developments, and we hope that democratization can become infectious.

But, again, we see a pattern, a slow-moving, visible, perceptible pattern that presages a crisis of a global nature - pressure against the Soviet Union to allow

(Mr. Maksoud)

Soviet Jews to emigrate and to be focused only towards Israel ultimately, restrictions on access of Soviet Jews to come to the United States - all these are harbingers of what is to come.

That is why we do not want the Palestinian people and the Arabs to become the resolution of the crisis of conscience on a global level in its second phase, as we witness today. That is why our Soviet friends had to put a halt to this issue by focusing attention on it, not as the result of a campaign that we the Arabs are conducting, but because it is a matter of national security for the future of the independent Palestinian State and for the future of the Arab nation as a whole. That is why we consider this to be a matter of serious and grave threat to the stability and security of the region, and it is a prescription to undermine all the efforts of international jurisdiction that has been asserting the rights of the Palestinian people to self-determination.

We believe in negotiations; we have often repeated this stand. But in the annals of diplomatic history never has an adversary party tried to determine who should represent the other adversary. Yet, I must say in reflection that the whole thrust of the Israeli opposition to the PLO designating its negotiators or dialoguers or discussers is predicated on the fact that Israelis do not recognize the Palestinians as their adversary, because recognizing the Palestinians as their adversary is symmetry of equality. To the Israelis, the Palestinians are the human obstacles to the unravelling of their manifest destiny. That is why they will not concede that the PLO is the embodiment of the national identity of the Palestinian people and their will to self-determination and independence; that is why they will not recognize the PLO; they will not even allow any direct visible or invisible relationship between the so-called negotiators. That is why the greatest concession they will make is to replace the internationally recognized national

(Mr. Maksoud)

rights of the Palestinians with municipal rights for Palestinian inhabitants in Judea and Samaria, as they say.

Hence, perhaps this whole issue brought about as a consequence of Soviet Jewish emigration must bring to the forefront and re-open the whole Palestinian question, for at stake is not only the destiny of the Palestinian States and not only the future of peace and security in the Middle East. What is equally important is also the insult to the human race which seeks to put forward that anti-Semitism is inevitable. And that is the Israeli predicate on which Israelis seek to defy the international community and the conscience of mankind. We reject the assumption that anti-Semitism is permanent. We think that we should all confront anti-Semitism and end discrimination of any sort. Therefore, those who claim to be fighting anti-Semitism and yet discriminate against the Palestinian Arabs are as bad as anti-Semites. We want to assume that not all of Israeli society and not all of the Jewish constituency believes in this contrived paranoia; but that the Jewish constituency does have faith in the human conscience and in the total defeat of nazism by the awareness and resilience of the human conscience, as well as in the defeat of all forms of racism against Jews and Palestinians alike everywhere.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I thank Mr. Maksoud for his kind words addressed to me.

There are no further speakers for this meeting. The next meeting of the Security Council to continue consideration of the item on the agenda will be fixed in consultation of the members of the Council.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.